DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 412 UD 026 708

AUTHOR Kelly, Eileen M.; Awad, Mary Ann R.
TITLE Education Consolidation and Improvement Act/Chapter 1: The New York State Annual Evaluation Report for 1987-88 Fiscal Year. Achievement Summary.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Bilingual Education Programs; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Limited English Speaking; *Mathematics Achievement; Norm Referenced Tests; Private Schools; Public Schools; *Reading Achievement; Supplementary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *New York

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on the achievement in basic skill areas attained by participants in compensatory education activities in New York State, which has established the priority areas of reading and mathematics. Over 200,000 pupils participated in Chapter 1 reading programs, and over 86,000 participated in Chapter 1 mathematics programs. Ten tables present data on the following: (1) reading program participants by grade level; (2) combined public and nonpublic school reading achievement, Fall 1987-Spring 1988 programs, English proficient students; (3) combined public and nonpublic school reading achievement, Spring 1987-Spring 1988 programs, English proficient students; (4) mathematics program participants by grade level; (5) combined public and nonpublic school mathematics achievement, Fall 1987-Spring 1988 programs, English proficient students; (6) combined public and nonpublic school mathematics achievement, Spring 1987-Spring 1988 programs, English proficient students; (7) Fall 1987-Spring 1988, limited English proficient students--public and nonpublic reading and mathematics achievement; (8) Spring 1987-Spring 1988, limited English proficient students--public and nonpublic--reading and mathematics achievement; (9) Fall 1987-Spring 1988, limited English proficient students--public and nonpublic reading in native language, and English as a Second Language reading achievement, and achievement in native language reading and mathematics; and (10) Spring 1987-Spring 1988, limited English proficient students--public and nonpublic--English as a second language reading achievement, and bilingual mathematics achievement. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

3-31-89

ED305412

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert M. Trombly
NYS Education Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT/CHAPTER 1

THE NEW YORK STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR 1987-88 FISCAL YEAR ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY

This report was filed with the
U.S. Department of Education
in partial fulfillment of the requirements under the
Education Consolidation and Improvement Act/Chapter 1

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

UD026708

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University

Martin C. Barell, Chancellor, B.A., I.A., LL.B. . . . . Muttontown
R. Carlos Carballada, Vice Chancellor, B.S. . . . . Rochester
Willard A. Genrich, LL.B. . . . . Buffalo
Emlyn I. Griffith, A.B., J.D. . . . . Rome
Jorge L. Batista, B.A., J.D. . . . . Bronx
Laura Bradley Chodos, B.A., M.A. . . . . Vischer Ferry
Louise P. Matteoni, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. . . . . Bayside
J. Edward Meyer, B.A., LL.B. . . . . Chappaqua
Floyd S. Linton, A.B., M.A., M.P.A. . . . . Miller Place
Mimi Levin Lieber, B.A., M.A. . . . . Manhattan
Shirley C. Brown, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. . . . . Albany
Norma Gluck, B.A., M.S.W. . . . . Manhattan
James W. McCabe, Sr., A.B., M.A. . . . . Johnson City
Adelaide L. Sanford, B.A., M.A., P.D. . . . . Hollis
Walter Cooper, B.A., Ph.D. . . . . Rochester
Gerald J. Lustig, B.A., M.D. . . . . Staten Island

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
Thomas Sobol

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
Thomas E. Sheldon

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education
Lionel R. Meno

Deputy Commissioner for School Improvement and Support
Arthur L. Walton

Assistant Commissioner for School Improvement, Grants Management and Compliance
Samuel W. Corsi

Director, Grants Management and Compliance
Michele I. Nowosad

Chief, Program Planning and Evaluation
James M. Sullivan

Assistant Commissioner for Elementary and Seconday Education Planning, Testing and Technological Services
John J. Murphy

Director, Division of E&S Education Planning
Michael S. Radlick

Chief, Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation
George A. Cronk, Jr.

FOREWORD

The 1987-88 ECIA Chapter 1 Annual Evaluation Report conforms to requirements set forth by the United States Department of Education by providing an annual summary of the ECIA Chapter 1 efforts in New York State. The report provides an overview of pupil achievement in supplementary reading and mathematics instruction.

The report was prepared by Eileen M. Kelly and Mary Ann R. Awad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	v
CHAPTER I: OVERVIEW	
Purpose of the Report	1
Procedures	1
Objectives	1
Parameters of District-Reported Data	2
Instrumentation	2
Data Aggregation	2
Methods of Analysis	3
Data Use	3
Limitations	3
Summary	4
CHAPTER II: READING ACHIEVEMENT	5
CHAPTER III: MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT	8
CHAPTER IV: ACHIEVEMENT OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS	11
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY	18

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Reading Program Participants by Grade Level	5
Table 2	Combined Public and Nonpublic School Reading Achievement, Fall-Spring Programs, English Proficient Students	6
Table 3	Combined Public and Nonpublic School Reading Achievement, Spring-Spring Programs, English Proficient Students	7
Table 4	Mathematics Program Participants by Grade Level	8
Table 5	Combined Public and Nonpublic School Mathematics Achievement, Fall-Spring Programs, English Proficient Students	9
Table 6	Combined Public and Nonpublic School Mathematics Achievement, Spring-Spring Programs, English Proficient Students	10
Table 7	Fall 1987-Spring 1988, Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic Normal Curve Equivalents	12
Table 8	Spring 1987-Spring 1988, Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic Normal Curve Equivalents	13
Table 9	Fall 1987-Spring 1988, Limited English Proficient Students - Public & Nonpublic Normal Curve Equivalents	14
Table 10	Spring 1987-Spring 1988, Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic Normal Curve Equivalents	16

Chapter 1

OVERVIEW

The 1987-88 Annual ECIA Chapter 1 Report focuses on the achievement in basic skill areas attained by participants in compensatory education activities. New York State has established the priority areas of corrective reading and mathematics.

The data present demonstrated changes in pupil achievement as assessed by standardized measures, usually collected by paper and pencil, as recorded by the pupils.

Purpose of the Report

The achievement summary was prepared to provide decision makers at local, State and Federal levels with a source of information on probable outcomes of compensatory efforts in the education of disadvantaged pupils. This report fulfills the Federal mandate for an annual evaluation summary of ECIA Chapter 1 funded activities.

For the purpose of obtaining comparable achievement data from which defensible conclusions might be drawn, districts were confined to reporting data from (1) cognitively oriented behavioral objectives, (2) comparable instruments that met requirements of empirically derived standardization, (3) analyses that involved statistical checks to reduce errors associated with measurement and (4) pupils who had a set of paired scores. These parameters, which were agreed upon before projects were funded, permitted the aggregation of similar data for drawing conclusions regarding the effectiveness of ECIA Chapter 1 funded compensatory activities statewide.

Procedures

Each of the projects included behavioral objectives, a schedule of data collection on specified measurement devices and a plan of data analysis. The summary of data in this report required a set of procedures that would encompass many varied objectives, tests and plans of data collection.

Objectives

District-prepared behavioral objectives indicate the area of behavioral change (e.g., reading comprehension) and the criterion measure for reference (e.g., the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Comprehension Subtest).

Parameters of District-Reported Data

Since many types of observations of behavior are available to district evaluators, a set of standards for data which would be summarized and reported to the State was necessary. Only standardized measures were permitted at the time each local ECIA Chapter 1 application for a project grant was approved. Individual pupil scores were transformed into either normal curve equivalents (NCEs) or percentile ranks for reporting data to the State. In all cases, only the scores for pupils who had taken both a pretest and posttest were used for the statewide analysis.

Instrumentation

A pupil's score taken from a norm referenced test (where test items were selected for their ability to discriminate between pupils) permits evaluators to assess a pupil's achievement relative to other pupils in the original norming population. On the other hand, criterion referenced devices provide an index of a pupil's mastery of a specific skill. The measurement devices employed in the ECIA Chapter 1 program were taken from instruments that met accepted conditions of reliability and validity.

The State reporting procedures had to be sufficiently comprehensive to accept data from different devices administered to differing subpopulations with a wide range of exposure to supplementary activities. The data reduction procedures, therefore, had to accommodate a number of factors associated with Chapter 1 supplementary services.

Data Aggregation

Data were subjected to a series of editing operations in preparation for statewide summaries. At the conclusion of the projects, districts submitted the Local Education Agency Programs (LEAP) Annual Evaluation Report which contained norm-referenced data. The data collection form is on file in the Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation. All districts reported their data to regional computer centers where preliminary edit checks were made. Data were first screened for completeness and reasonableness. All data were reported for individual students. Thus, statistical computations by the local educational agencies were not necessary. The data were then grouped by subject area and grade level.

Method of Analysis

Individual norm-referenced scores were converted to Normal Curve Equivalents and aggregated by school and by district. Weighted averages were calculated for each grade level in each subject area. These were then analyzed for differences between pretest and posttest for two testing schedules; i.e., fall-to-spring and spring-to-spring.

Data Use

In addition to meeting the reporting requirements of the State and Federal Departments of Education, test results are important indicators for local educational agency personnel. A variety of decision makers, both individuals and groups, have an impact on an educational system. In the ECIA Chapter 1 context at the local level, major decision makers include students, parents, teachers, coordinators, building principals, superintendents, school boards, and parent advisory councils.

The decisions made by these individuals and groups answer a broad span of educational questions such as:

- In what reading group does a pupil belong?
- Where on the mathematics skills array should this group of pupils start?
- Are students learning more in reading or mathematics projects?
- Should the current ECIA Chapter 1 project be modified or continued next year without any changes?

Limitations

The several procedures for preparing the achievement summary had to be sufficiently sound to yield defensible findings while still being flexible enough to accommodate various objectives, various measurement devices, and different subpopulations. Furthermore, the reduction of data for a summary tends to conceal specific effects at particular grade levels in a given subject area for a specific instructional mode. When a pretest or posttest score was missing from a pupil's data set, or other serious errors were discovered in a pupil record, the pupil's information was eliminated from the analysis.

Summary

ECIA Chapter 1 authorizes grants to public education agencies to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. Programs provide educational and support services which supplement the regular program offered by the public education agency. Payments are made to state educational agencies for grants to local education agencies.

The 1987-88 school year marks the twenty-second year of the New York State programs for the educationally disadvantaged, first under ESEA Title I and subsequently under ECIA Chapter 1. Since its inception in September 1965, the programs have undergone several transformations in response to the special educational needs of a constantly shifting population of children. The number of pupils, number of schools, and level of funding have fluctuated greatly. The program structure itself has matured, however, despite the fluctuation in the size of the program participation group.

The target population served by the 1987-88 program includes students who were identified as achieving at or below the 35th NCE in either reading or mathematics.

During the planning cycle for 1987-88, the most acute program need identified by ECIA Chapter 1 staff was that of raising the achievement levels of identified Chapter 1 pupils in both reading and mathematics. Although pupils continue to learn over the course of a school year, in general, their achievement level remains the same relative to other pupils. That is, their rank tends to remain level. Thus, without extra help, a pupil who scored at the 35th NCE on the pretest would probably score at the same level on the posttest. The scores for Chapter 1 participants showed that students participating in the program achieved more in reading and mathematics than they would have without the program. Relative rankings moved upwards for these pupils.

Chapter II

READING ACHIEVEMENT

In New York State over 200,000 pupils participated in Chapter 1 funded reading programs. These programs provided supplemental services for pupils in grades kindergarten through grade twelve. Table 1 illustrates the number of pupils served in ECIA Chapter 1 reading programs by grade level.

Table 1

Reading Program Participants by Grade Level

Grade	Number of Pupils Served
K	4,598
1	30,513
2	25,040
3	25,978
4	22,533
5	19,915
6	15,918
7	16,679
8	12,668
9	11,677
10	8,797
11	7,437
12	3,440
15*	477
TOTAL	205,670

* 15 Ungraded

An analysis of the reading achievement of pupils tested on either a fall/spring testing cycle or on a spring/spring testing cycle reveals that pupils in Chapter 1 have made substantial gains in achievement. Table 2 and Table 3 demonstrate these achievement gains for English proficient students.

Table 2

NEW YORK STATE
Fall 1987-Spring 1988
English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Reading Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	1,451	76	20.3	39.3	19.0
1	11,155	274	33.2	43.4	10.2
2	7,919	77	27.0	40.6	13.5
3	5,738	73	30.1	41.7	11.6
4	5,633	73	32.7	41.2	8.5
5	5,316	74	34.3	42.0	7.7
6	4,050	72	34.5	40.6	6.1
7	3,642	80	35.3	40.2	4.9
8	2,898	79	35.4	40.2	4.8
9	1,822	80	35.2	40.4	5.2
10	907	72	32.6	39.9	7.3
11	438	62	30.4	37.0	6.6
12	208	72	25.9	34.2	8.3
15*	142	120	28.5	56.0	27.5
Total	51,319				

* Ungraded

Table 3

NEW YORK STATE
Spring 1987-Spring 1988
English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Reading Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	317	66	25.9	52.2	26.3
1	4,461	66	33.2	42.5	9.3
2	9,564	70	33.9	39.8	5.9
3	12,046	72	32.5	39.2	6.7
4	11,458	75	36.6	41.8	5.2
5	9,465	75	37.6	44.3	6.7
6	7,478	73	38.2	40.3	2.1
7	7,902	82	37.5	40.6	3.1
8	6,025	76	37.3	40.2	2.9
9	4,842	60	39.9	40.5	0.6
10	3,914	49	40.7	40.4	-0.3
11	1,579	48	39.0	39.6	0.6
12	358	42	30.5	35.7	5.2
15*	81	67	28.7	39.5	10.8
Total	79,490				

* Ungraded

Under a fall/spring testing schedule as well as a spring/spring testing schedule it is expected that without supplemental instruction students will maintain their relative standing and the difference between students' pretest scores and posttest scores will be zero. In all cases except in grade 10, New York State students showed significant gains in reading achievement.

New York State Chapter 1 reading programs parallel the national Chapter 1 reading program in that a greater degree of services are provided to elementary students.

It should also be noted that the amount of gain in achievement is greater at the elementary level than at the secondary level. Once again this parallels the national data.

Pupils in Chapter 1 programs are profiting to a great degree from these services. New York State students are showing improvement in reading achievement.

Chapter III

MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT

In New York State over 86,000 pupils participated in Chapter 1 funded mathematics programs. These programs provided supplemental services for pupils in grades kindergarten through grade twelve. Table 4 illustrates the number of pupils served in ECIA Chapter 1 mathematics programs by grade level.

Table 4

Mathematics Program Participants by Grade Level

Grade	Number of Pupils Served
K	572
1	4,577
2	8,456
3	2,127
4	1,030
5	9,844
6	9,434
7	8,057
8	6,421
9	7,629
10	4,434
11	2,223
12	902
15*	300
TOTAL	86,006

* Ungraded

An analysis of mathematics achievement of English proficient pupils tested on either a fall/spring testing cycle or on a spring/spring testing cycle reveals that pupils in Chapter 1 programs have made substantial gains in achievement. Tables 5 and 6, show by grade level the number of pupils having both pretest and posttest data and the gains made by these pupils.

Table 5

NEW YORK STATE
Fall 1987-Spring 1988
English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Mathematics Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	46	24	39.0	50.8	11.8
1	1,608	67	29.4	44.9	15.5
2	2,369	65	27.1	47.1	20.0
3	2,594	65	29.4	45.6	16.2
4	2,361	66	32.2	45.0	12.8
5	2,181	65	32.4	43.5	11.1
6	2,145	65	32.5	43.8	11.3
7	1,432	71	35.6	43.2	7.6
8	1,248	68	36.4	41.5	5.1
9	614	61	36.7	43.2	6.5
10	259	62	40.0	45.2	4.7
11	102	64	40.8	47.3	6.5
12	59	66	45.4	48.2	2.8
15*	37	104	29.7	52.4	22.7
Total	17,055				

* Ungraded

Table 6

NEW YORK STATE
Spring 1987-Spring 1988
English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Mathematics Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	343	70	24.9	56.4	31.5
1	1,365	60	32.1	47.8	15.7
2	3,118	57	31.8	45.1	13.3
3	6,080	65	33.8	44.2	10.4
4	5,902	69	33.3	42.8	9.5
5	5,325	68	35.9	42.1	6.2
6	4,928	67	34.9	41.9	7.0
7	4,341	69	36.4	37.9	1.5
8	3,410	67	34.3	36.7	2.4
9	1,092	75	34.0	39.5	5.5
10	324	43	34.3	40.5	6.2
11	133	35	34.2	39.1	4.9
12	54	33	29.5	34.8	5.3
15*	96	51	25.4	44.4	19.0
Total	36,511				

* Ungraded

In all cases it is evident that pupils performed above what would have been expected had supplemental services not been provided. Additionally, the exceptionally high gains made by elementary school pupils attest to the success of the programs at these grade levels where the majority of pupils are served. New York State pupils in Chapter 1 mathematics programs are making significant achievement gains.

Chapter IV

ACHIEVEMENT of LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PUPILS

Data for New York State ECIA Chapter 1 pupils with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) were analyzed separately from the data for English proficient students. Although several testing designs and instruments are used to measure the achievement of LEP pupils, the figures shown in Tables 7 through 10 represent the achievement of pupils who were tested with a norm-referenced test. Thus, the scores reported are in normal curve equivalents (NCEs). It is evident from these data that LEP pupils are benefiting from Chapter 1 programs. Additionally it can be noted that the majority of LEP pupils being served are in the elementary grades.

Table 7

NEW YORK STATE
Fall 1987-Spring 1988
Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Reading Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	88	90	21.4	38.3	16.9
1	542	314	32.1	39.9	7.8
2	1,048	41	22.2	27.6	5.4
3	1,115	33	21.2	29.2	8.0
4	1,208	38	22.7	27.3	4.6
5	975	36	25.5	28.1	2.6
6	886	35	28.0	31.0	3.0
7	616	30	29.9	32.9	3.0
8	309	33	29.3	32.2	2.9
9	95	48	24.1	30.0	5.9
10	79	27	33.1	36.9	3.8
11	82	27	23.1	25.2	2.1
12	23	38	20.9	32.7	11.8
15*	32	56	22.5	23.5	1.0
Total	7,098				

* Ungraded

Mathematics Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	41	107	17.4	39.7	22.3
2	725	39	16.5	38.0	21.5
3	965	38	15.3	31.1	15.8
4	821	36	17.6	38.4	20.8
5	607	36	19.2	30.5	11.3
6	531	34	20.1	37.3	17.2
7	273	32	24.3	38.5	14.2
8	159	27	20.4	30.0	9.6
9	79	23	30.8	39.4	8.6
10	58	24	29.6	35.8	6.2
11	31	27	25.1	31.5	6.4
12	4	16	19.8	29.8	10.0
Total	4,294				

Table 8

NEW YORK STATE
Spring 1987-Spring 1988
Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Reading Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
1	74	78	21.4	30.8	9.5
2	158	102	27.6	30.3	2.7
3	286	77	26.0	30.4	4.4
4	330	81	23.4	27.4	4.0
5	187	71	26.9	34.0	7.1
6	160	92	31.9	33.0	1.1
7	203	69	22.6	31.3	8.7
8	121	58	27.9	29.6	1.7
9	168	39	29.7	30.7	1.0
10	114	46	29.5	29.5	0.0
11	139	43	23.5	27.5	4.0
12	175	42	19.9	28.9	9.0
Total	2,115				

Mathematics Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	9	58	24.6	54.2	29.6
1	39	59	23.5	48.7	25.2
2	100	84	28.0	38.4	10.4
3	290	79	29.3	40.2	10.9
4	207	69	26.8	36.7	9.9
5	165	66	32.9	38.7	5.8
6	139	71	32.7	39.2	6.5
7	83	51	30.2	34.7	4.5
8	63	61	23.8	27.4	3.6
9	24	56	30.0	36.1	6.1
10	3	20	30.3	49.3	19.0
11	1	95	45.0	51.0	6.0
12	1	145	30.0	37.0	7.0
15*	30	56	17.7	19.5	1.8
Total	1,154				

* Ungraded

Table 9

NEW YORK STATE
Fall 1987-Spring 1988
Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic
Bilingual Reading Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
1	339	195	42.8	46.7	4.1
2	380	201	26.3	39.0	12.7
3	207	200	29.7	35.4	5.7
4	130	205	23.7	29.1	5.4
5	129	206	27.1	31.8	4.7
6	69	207	22.7	28.8	6.1
9	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
Total	1,254				
	Reading in Native Language				
1	379	93	47.2	58.6	11.4
2	684	75	50.6	53.6	3.0
3	480	74	41.9	50.9	9.0
4	411	74	47.2	52.5	5.3
5	271	75	49.8	54.9	5.1
6	233	74	51.5	58.0	6.5
7	127	51	44.7	49.8	5.1
8	69	49	45.6	51.3	5.7
9	26	42	58.8	67.5	8.7
Total	2,680				
	English as a Second Language Reading				
KG	232	85	15.1	39.0	23.9
1	604	69	18.7	26.6	7.9
2	431	78	14.3	29.9	15.6
3	478	56	22.0	35.3	13.3
4	432	68	20.6	28.4	7.8
5	281	71	16.6	25.7	9.1
6	264	77	15.8	24.9	9.1
7	337	69	13.3	19.6	6.3
8	261	78	11.6	19.2	7.6
9	17	79	12.8	22.4	9.6
10	19	130	27.5	35.2	7.7
11	32	142	29.3	37.8	8.5
12	8	188	34.4	47.8	13.4
Total	3,396				

Table 9 (Continued)

English as a Second Language

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
KG	784	53	16.9	36.8	19.9
1	1,053	54	17.4	31.6	14.2
2	490	52	28.3	41.9	13.6
3	99	116	17.9	31.0	13.1
4	92	113	14.0	24.1	10.1
5	72	116	19.3	29.5	10.2
6	104	112	14.1	24.1	10.0
7	131	114	14.0	21.6	7.0
8	158	117	14.6	23.2	8.6
9	64	103	17.1	26.1	9.0
10	7	138	8.9	27.4	18.5
11	5	75	21.8	32.0	10.2
12	13	96	27.0	42.7	15.7
Total	3,072				
	Mathematics in Native Language				
1	367	101	32.7	57.5	24.8
2	676	71	44.8	59.8	15.0
3	467	67	40.6	50.4	9.8
4	324	62	46.8	54.2	7.4
5	264	74	47.9	52.0	4.1
6	209	70	46.3	54.7	8.4
7	125	34	39.3	45.5	6.2
8	68	32	39.0	44.9	5.9
9	26	28	48.0	59.2	11.2
Total	2,526				

Table 10

NEW YORK STATE
Spring 1987-Spring 1988
Limited English Proficient Students -- Public & Nonpublic

Bilingual Reading Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
2	123	44	35.1	36.9	1.8
3	144	42	32.7	36.4	3.7
4	133	40	35.8	37.9	2.1
5	68	34	32.1	35.4	3.3
6	58	34	35.4	31.7	-3.7
7	60	49	30.9	36.1	5.2
8	19	29	30.2	35.2	5.0
9	525	158	10.0	14.9	4.9
10	638	132	9.8	16.0	6.2
11	276	129	13.7	17.4	3.7
12	70	131	13.1	19.6	6.5
Total	2,114				

English as a Second Language Reading

1	103	127	8.9	21.5	12.6
2	302	85	16.6	24.5	7.9
3	311	112	17.0	26.4	9.4
4	182	96	19.4	22.4	3.0
5	148	81	17.2	23.6	6.4
6	169	98	14.5	26.3	11.8
7	109	101	14.2	21.3	7.1
8	92	98	13.1	16.5	3.4
9	43	131	15.2	26.4	11.2
10	26	105	42.5	55.4	12.9
11	12	120	33.4	38.0	4.6
12	7	125	28.6	37.4	8.8
Total	1,504				

Table 10 (Continued)

English as a Second Language

KG	25	92	29.4	49.5	20.1
1	104	91	40.5	48.2	7.7
2	295	82	25.7	37.8	12.1
3	141	71	26.1	37.8	11.7
4	258	76	23.5	31.6	8.1
5	204	79	20.9	30.9	10.0
6	126	87	13.1	25.5	12.4
7	114	58	20.5	27.6	7.1
8	89	52	18.2	21.4	3.2
9	18	105	26.0	40.1	14.1
Total	1,374				

Bilingual Mathematics Achievement

GRADE	NUMBER of STUDENTS	MEAN CONTACT HOURS	NCE PRETEST MEAN	NCE POSTTEST MEAN	NCE DIFFERENCE
2	18	29	27.4	46.8	19.4
3	130	29	45.0	47.4	2.4
4	120	27	39.0	40.3	1.3
5	54	31	35.0	38.0	3.0
6	48	31	36.7	36.0	-0.7
7	56	34	38.4	38.3	-0.1
8	21	13	34.0	35.6	1.6
Total	447				

Chapter V

SUMMARY

The goal of compensatory education is to help children whose basic skills are below an acceptable level to overcome their disadvantagement and raise their level of achievement. Educators learn whether their pupils have achieved this goal through the process of evaluation. It is an integral part of the process of assessing needs, planning programs, and providing instruction. It provides the information needed to make effective decisions throughout the program.

Decision makers need information at various levels, from individual pupils to the entire school population of the State. The object of evaluation at any level is to provide reliable and useful information about progress at the various levels with minimal disruption of the instructional process and minimal effort by the teachers and administrators who must collect and report the information.

Over 272,000 pupils were reported via the New York State Local Education Agency Programs (LEAP) reporting and evaluation system as being served in ECIA Chapter 1 programs. Although this report only reflects the achievement of pupils in reading, mathematics, and bilingual/ESL programs, pupils also made substantial gains in other achievement areas, such as reading readiness and writing.

New York State is committed to ensuring that Chapter 1 programs are coordinated with the pupil's total program. The pupil performance shown in this report demonstrates the success of Chapter 1 at all grade levels.